

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/517,246	12/07/2004	Matthias Muth	DE02 0147 US	3106	
65913 NXP, B,V,	7590 01/06/20	01/06/2009		EXAMINER	
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			FEARER,	FEARER, MARK D	
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKA	Y DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, CA 95131			2443		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/06/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail $\,$ address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/517,246	MUTH, MATTHIAS			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	MARK D. FEARER	2443			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) Application No. -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 22 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) X The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706,07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from; (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed. may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal: and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-14. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____ AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the independent claim 1 recites in part "characterized in that the system is changed over from the subnetwork operation to the full network operation through the detection of at least one defined, especially continuous and/or especially symmetrical signal level pattern in the data traffic on the system," where the subnetwork operation is described as "in which at least one node and/or at least one user of the system is in a state of reduced current consumption and is not addressed and/or not activated by the signal level of the data traffic on the system." These limitations are not disclosed in the cited references of Boezen et al. and Markkula et al. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claim 1 is not obvious even if the teachings of Boezen et al. and Markkula et al. are combined. Examiner respectfully disagrees, Boezen et al. discloses a controller area network bus driver with symmetrical differential output signals comprising defined, symmetrical signal level pattern in the data traffic (("Such a bus driver is known from European Patent Specification EP 0 576 444 and is used in so-called Controller Area Network (CAN) bus systems which are used, inter alia, in cars. For this, use is made of transceivers (transmitter/receiver), information being transmitted as a differential signal via a two-wire bus having its two wires connected to the first and the second bus terminal. The transmitter supplies data signals to the bus and is from now on referred to as bus driver. The two bus wires are usually referred to as CANH and CANL and are connected to a pull-down resistor and a pull-up resistor at the receiver side. The voltages across the two bus wires have opposite

polarities, as a result of which the spurious electromagnetic fields radiated by the two wires cancel one another. In the case of a high degree of symmetry the bus wires can take the form of a twisted pair and no expensive shielding is necessary. For this purpose the symmetry of the signals on the two bus wires should be as high as possible," polumn 1 lines 25-43) Markfull et al. discloses a network and intelligent cell for providing sensing, bidirectional communications aloration control comprising full

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454

Application No.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20081230